

62

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**Single Bench : Hon'ble Shri H.L. Dattu, C.J.**

**W.P. No.1589 of 2005**

**Petitioner**

B.L. Kashyap, S/o Late Shriram Kashyap,  
Aged about 59 years, Presently working as  
Time Keeper, Water Resources  
Department, Sub-Division Bhopal  
Pattnam, Division Dantewada, District  
Dantewada (C.G.)

versus

**Respondents**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the  
Secretary, Water Resources Department,  
Mantralaya, D.K.S.Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Engineer-in-Chief, Water Resources  
Department, Raipur (C.G.)
3. Executive Engineer, Water Resources  
Department, Division Dantewada, District  
Dantewada (C.G.)
4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Water Resources  
Department, Sub-Division Bhopal Pattnam,  
Division Dantewada, District Dantewada  
(C.G.)

**Present :** Shri Ashish Shrivastava, counsel for the petitioner.  
Shri Sumesh Bajaj, Government Advocate for the State.

**ORAL ORDER**

**(Passed on 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2007)**

The petitioner was working as a Timekeeper on daily wage basis.

(2) At the verge of his retirement from the service, he had filed a representation before the respondents to consider his case for regularization. Since that was not done by the respondents, he is before this Court in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India in the year 2005.

(3) Learned Government Advocate appearing for the State/respondents, by way of preliminary objection, would submit that there is enormous delay in filing the writ petition and, therefore, the writ petition requires to be rejected.

(4) Admittedly, the petitioner was working as a Timekeeper on daily wage basis right from the year 1979. It is only just on the verge of his retirement from the service, he approached the respondents for regularization of his services. There is a delay of nearly two decades from the date of his initial appointment on daily wage basis. The delay in filing the representation and thereafter approaching to this Court is fatal to the proceedings, therefore, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

(5) In that view of the matter, the writ petition requires to be and is rejected. Ordered accordingly.

**Sd/-  
Chief Justice**